



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date May 5, 2017
Report Subject Final Report of Investigation	

SYNOPSIS

We initiated this investigation in March 2017 after the U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of the Solicitor reported allegations brought forward by Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ, harassed CRIT employees and tribal members by sending them unwanted—and often sexually explicit—texts and Facebook messages. (b) (7)(C) also alleged that (b) (7)(C) conduct had caused a CRIT employee and a CRIT tribal member to file injunctions against harassment on (b) (7)(C) out of concern for their own safety. This investigation focused on (b) (7)(C) conduct as a U.S. Government employee; on March 31, 2017, we opened a separate investigation into BIA's response to reports of (b) (7)(C) misconduct.

We substantiated the allegations against (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) admitted to us that he had sent sexually explicit texts, Facebook messages, and handwritten notes to CRIT employees and tribal members. We confirmed that these texts, messages, and notes were unwelcome and found that (b) (7)(C) had sent some of them while on duty. We also confirmed that a CRIT employee and a tribal member had filed injunctions against him because his conduct had caused them to fear for their safety.

We found that (b) (7)(C) conduct, both on and off duty, was egregious and unprofessional, and that it reflected poorly on the Government. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that his conduct was unprofessional and inappropriate for a Government employee.

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
Approving Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /SAC	Signature Digitally signed.
Authentication Number: 794D223BDF376D299457A7FB375FEA43	

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-002 (05/10)

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

We opened this investigation on March 21, 2017, after the U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of the Solicitor reported allegations to us that the office received in a letter forwarded by (b) (7)(C) of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' (BIA's) Colorado River Agency (CRA). The letter, which came from Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) (b) (7)(C), alleged that CRA (b) (7)(C) had sent unwanted—and often sexually explicit—texts and Facebook messages to CRIT employees and tribal members. (b) (7)(C) also alleged that (b) (7)(C) conduct had caused a CRIT employee and a CRIT tribal member to fear for their safety so much that they had injunctions against harassment placed on (b) (7)(C).

We focused our investigation on (b) (7)(C) conduct as a Government employee and not on how BIA responded to reports of (b) (7)(C) misconduct. On March 31, 2017, we initiated a separate investigation into BIA's response. As of the date of this report, that investigation was ongoing.

(b) (7)(C) Conduct toward CRIT Employees and Tribal Members

We interviewed (b) (7)(C) who told us that during a tribal council meeting in January 2017, complaints against (b) (7)(C) by CRIT employees and tribal members were addressed (**Attachments 1 and 2**). (b) (7)(C) said that before this meeting, he had known about a 2016 incident in which (b) (7)(C) sent inappropriate messages to (b) (7)(C), but that matter had been resolved when (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) to stop.

After additional complaints against (b) (7)(C) were raised in the January 2017 meeting, (b) (7)(C) directed CRIT (b) (7)(C) to draft the complaint letter to (b) (7)(C) documenting the allegations (**Attachment 3**). (b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C) signed the complaint letter because he (b) (7)(C) was on travel, but he was familiar with the letter's contents. We also interviewed (b) (7)(C), who acknowledged drafting the complaint letter at (b) (7)(C) direction (**Attachments 4 and 5**).

We reviewed the complaint letter, which named (b) (7)(C)—all CRIT employees or tribal members—whom (b) (7)(C) had allegedly harassed. We interviewed (b) (7)(C), and all confirmed that (b) (7)(C) had sent them messages via text, Facebook, or handwritten note, and that these messages were unwanted and often sexually explicit.

(b) (7)(C) Sent Unwanted Sexually Explicit Messages to a CRIT Tribal Member

We interviewed (b) (7)(C), a CRIT (b) (7)(C), who told us that sometime before October 2015 (b) (7)(C) placed a handwritten note in her home mailbox asking her if she was single, married, or bisexual (**Attachments 6 and 7**). On October 10, 2015, (b) (7)(C) began sending her unwanted graphic and sexually explicit Facebook messages (**Attachment 8**). (b) (7)(C) said she did not reply to the messages.

We also interviewed (b) (7)(C) who admitted to putting the note in (b) (7)(C) mailbox and sending her the explicit Facebook messages (**Attachments 9 and 10**). He told us he knew who (b) (7)(C) was (b) (7)(C), whom he had worked with. When asked why he sent the messages, he told us that he wanted to go out with (b) (7)(C) and acknowledged that he wanted to have sex with her; but, he said, he “didn’t want to be serious about it.”

(b) (7)(C) *Sent Unwanted Sexually Explicit Text Messages to a CRIT Employee*

We interviewed **(b) (7)(C)** CRIT **(b) (7)(C)** who told us that **(b) (7)(C)** contacted her through Facebook sometime in August 2016 and asked her whether she was **(b) (7)(C)** **(b) (7)(C)** (Attachments 11 and 12). She said she replied that she was, and within a couple of days, **(b) (7)(C)** again contacted her through Facebook and told her she was “hot.” **(b) (7)(C)** said she showed the Facebook message to her **(b) (7)(C)**, and he agreed to talk to **(b) (7)(C)** about it. She said her **(b) (7)(C)** also told her that **(b) (7)(C)** had been in trouble for texting other women. According to **(b) (7)(C)** **(b) (7)(C)** did not “bother” her again until September 4, 2016.

At approximately 9:30 p.m. on September 4, 2016, **(b) (7)(C)** said, she received over 70 “very explicit” text messages from a phone number that was not in her contact list (Attachment 13 and see Attachments 11 and 12). The following morning, she received an additional 5 or 10 text messages; these came from a different phone number, she said, but they were similar in tone to the ones she had received the previous night, and she suspected they were from the same person (Attachment 14). **(b) (7)(C)** said she reported the incident to **(b) (7)(C)** and gave him copies of the text messages, and he notified the CRIT Police Department.

(b) (7)(C) said that she spoke to a CRIT Police Department Investigator **(b) (7)(C)**, who recognized one of the phone numbers from other complaints he had received and told her it belonged to **(b) (7)(C)**. **(b) (7)(C)** said she did not know whether her **(b) (7)(C)** had spoken to **(b) (7)(C)** again after this incident, but **(b) (7)(C)** had stopped sending her text messages.

(b) (7)(C) admitted that he began communicating with **(b) (7)(C)** by telling her that she was hot and that he later sent her sexually explicit text messages (see Attachments 9 and 10). He also acknowledged that **(b) (7)(C)** told him to stop texting his **(b) (7)(C)**. When asked why he sent **(b) (7)(C)** the messages, **(b) (7)(C)** said he was “feeling lonely” and was trying to get a “hookup.” **(b) (7)(C)** said he knew who **(b) (7)(C)** was because he had previously **(b) (7)(C)**.

(b) (7)(C) *Sent Unwanted Text Messages to another CRIT Employee*

CRIT **(b) (7)(C)** Water Resources and Irrigation **(b) (7)(C)** told us that in early 2013, **(b) (7)(C)** sent her text messages asking her whether she was single and whether her cell phone was personal (Attachments 15, 16, and 17). **(b) (7)(C)** who worked in the same general area as **(b) (7)(C)** said she told him to get “back to work” and that he did not “need to know that.” Several months later, she said, **(b) (7)(C)** again sent her text messages, this time telling her that he had been thinking about her and how pretty she looked (Attachment 18). Subsequently, **(b) (7)(C)** said, she informed one of **(b) (7)(C)** supervisors, **(b) (7)(C)** about the unwanted text messages; she said she told him **(b) (7)(C)** had no business texting her and she felt uncomfortable about it.

In late 2016, **(b) (7)(C)** said, she received a text message from an unknown phone number. The person who sent the text asked her who she was, stated that her number was in a “sexting list,” and wanted to know if she wanted to “sext with me” (that is, exchange sexual text messages). **(b) (7)(C)** told us she did not have a record of the message because she was having issues with her phone at the time and a “total reboot” of her phone had “erased” everything. She said, however, that she later received another text from what she recognized as the same phone number; this time the person identified himself as **(b) (7)(C)** (Attachment 19). **(b) (7)(C)** said the message bothered her and she suspected it was

(b) (7)(C) texting her again. She said that she approached another of (b) (7)(C) supervisors, (b) (7)(C) and showed him the text messages, and he confirmed to her that the phone number used to send them was (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) confirmed to us that (b) (7)(C) had spoken to him about the text messages (**Attachments 20 and 21**).

(b) (7)(C) admitted that he sent (b) (7)(C) the text messages in 2013 and 2016 (see **Attachments 9 and 10**). He told us that he initially texted (b) (7)(C) because his (b) (7)(C) had “kicked [him] out” of their home; he said he was “feeling down” and “looking for a date.” (b) (7)(C) said he texted (b) (7)(C) again in 2016 because some time had passed since 2013 and he thought she might be “interested” and want to go out with him. He acknowledged that he used his (b) (7)(C), when he texted (b) (7)(C) in 2016.

During our interview of (b) (7)(C) we showed him copies of all text and Facebook messages associated with (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C). He admitted that he had sent them. He also acknowledged that his conduct was unprofessional and inappropriate for a Government employee.

(b) (7)(C) Sent a Graphic Text Message to a CRIT Council Member

CRIT (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) told us in an interview that on December 6, 2016, she received a graphic text message from (b) (7)(C) asking her if she had had sex with his (b) (7)(C) (**Attachments 22, 23, and 24**). (b) (7)(C) explained that she had given (b) (7)(C) her number some time before so that they could arrange a meeting for (b) (7)(C) to purchase a (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated that during the first week of December 2016, she received a text message from (b) (7)(C) asking her “do you like other women,” followed by the December 6 text asking her if she had had sex with his (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) told us that she did not reply to the messages and that she learned through her (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) had sent similar texts to other CRIT tribal members. Subsequently, she said, her (b) (7)(C) helped her block his number from her cell phone.

(b) (7)(C) admitted sending (b) (7)(C) the text message (see **Attachments 9 and 10**). When asked why he sent it, he said that he saw a number on his (b) (7)(C) phone that he did not recognize. He told us that he sent the message because he suspected his (b) (7)(C) was cheating on him, but said that he did not know whom he was sending the message to.

(b) (7)(C) Left a Sexually Explicit Handwritten Note on a CRIT Employee’s Vehicle

(b) (7)(C) alleged that sometime in 2015, (b) (7)(C) left an explicit note, written on the back of a BIA log sheet, at the home of CRIT employee (b) (7)(C) (**Attachment 25** and see **Attachments 1 and 2**). (b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (7)(C) in the note if she wanted to “sext.”

We did not interview (b) (7)(C) but when we asked (b) (7)(C) about this note, he admitted to writing it on the log sheet and placing it on (b) (7)(C) car windshield (see **Attachments 9 and 10**). (b) (7)(C) told us that he knew (b) (7)(C) was single and that he wanted to go out with her.

(b) (7)(C) Sent Some of These Messages While on Duty

We asked (b) (7)(C) whether he had sent any of his texts or Facebook messages, or left any of his handwritten notes, during work hours (see **Attachments 9 and 10**). (b) (7)(C) told us he did not remember because his work schedule varied—he explained that he would work a month on (b) (7)(C) shift followed by a month on (b) (7)(C) shift—but he acknowledged that he could have sent messages during

work hours. (b) (7)(C) confirmed to us that (b) (7)(C) was never issued a Government cell phone. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that he used his personal phone to send the text messages.

At our request, (b) (7)(C) office provided all of his available work schedules from January 2015 through March 2017, and we reviewed this information to determine whether (b) (7)(C) had sent any messages while on duty (**Attachments 26**). We established that (b) (7)(C) sent Facebook messages to (b) (7)(C) and text messages to (b) (7)(C) during his scheduled duty hours. We also confirmed through the Federal Personnel Payroll System that he was paid for working on the days he sent those messages.

(b) (7)(C) Conduct Caused Several CRIT Employees and Tribal Members to Fear for Their Safety

(b) (7)(C) told us that during his January 2017 tribal council meeting, (b) (7)(C) appeared “distressed” when she disclosed to him that she had been dealing with (b) (7)(C) for years, and that she seemed “fearful” because she worked (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) sites where (b) (7)(C) worked (see **Attachments 1 and 2**).

(b) (7)(C) told us that she felt “extremely unsafe” at work because (b) (7)(C) knew her and knew which vehicle she drove (see **Attachments 15 and 16**). She said that when she told (b) (7)(C) about (b) (7)(C) texts, (b) (7)(C) advised her to report (b) (7)(C) to the CRIT Police Department. (b) (7)(C) said she was reluctant to report him because she was concerned about retaliation, but after she spoke with other women in the CRIT community, she decided to seek an injunction against harassment. She petitioned for and received the injunction against (b) (7)(C) from the Parker Justice Court, Parker, AZ, on (b) (7)(C) 2017 (**Attachment 27**).

(b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) had not contacted her since the injunction, and added that she had arranged with his supervisors to ensure she would have no contact with him when she had to visit the (b) (7)(C) where he worked. (b) (7)(C) confirmed that (b) (7)(C) had provided him a copy of the injunction and asked him to ensure it was enforced (see **Attachments 20 and 21**).

(b) (7)(C) told us that she was afraid to go outside her home and explained that her house was next to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) had worked (see **Attachments 6 and 7**). She said she knew (b) (7)(C) drove a (b) (7)(C) and she would often see a (b) (7)(C) at the (b) (7)(C) when she went outside. Because she did not know what (b) (7)(C) looked like, she worried that he could be sitting in the (b) (7)(C) watching her.

(b) (7)(C) said that after she reported (b) (7)(C) to the CRIT Police Department, she filed for and received an injunction against (b) (7)(C) from the CRIT Tribal Court (**Attachment 28**). She acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) had not made contact with her since the injunction was issued (on (b) (7)(C) 2016).

(b) (7)(C) told us that she too was concerned for her safety, explaining that she lived home (b) (7)(C) during the week because her (b) (7)(C) (see **Attachments 22 and 23**). She said that although she continued to walk for exercise along the main road near her house, she no longer walked along the canals unless her (b) (7)(C) was home. (b) (7)(C) said she had requested a restraining order against (b) (7)(C) through the CRIT Tribal Court, but the request was denied.

We interviewed CRIT Police Department (b) (7)(C), who confirmed he had investigated (b) (7)(C) conduct toward CRIT members (Attachments 29 and 30). (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that due to workload and other priority cases, he did not interview (b) (7)(C) but said he did interview (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) and he obtained copies of the relevant texts, Facebook messages, and handwritten notes. (b) (7)(C) stated, and we confirmed, that no other Federal, State, or local law enforcement authorities had investigated (b) (7)(C).

SUBJECT

(b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency, BIA.

DISPOSITION

We are providing this report to BIA (b) (7)(C) for any action he deems appropriate.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Investigative Activity Report (IAR) – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
2. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
3. Letter from (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C), dated February 13, 2017
4. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
5. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
6. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
7. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
8. Facebook Messages received by (b) (7)(C) from October 10, 2015 thru August 16, 2016
9. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 31, 2017
10. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 31, 2017
11. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
12. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 29, 2017
13. Text Messages received by (b) (7)(C) on September 4, 2016
14. Text Messages received by (b) (7)(C) on September 5, 2016
15. IAR- Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
16. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
17. Text Messages received by (b) (7)(C) from April 2, 2013 thru April 16, 2013
18. Text Messages received by (b) (7)(C) on August 7, 2013
19. Text Messages received by (b) (7)(C) on November, 9, 2016
20. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
21. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
22. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
23. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
24. Text Message received by (b) (7)(C) on December 6, 2016
25. Handwritten Note to (b) (7)(C)
26. IAR – Document Review of (b) (7)(C) Work Schedules and FPPS on April 24, 2017
27. Injunction Against Harassment, dated January 23, 2017
28. Injunction Against Harassment, dated August 29, 2016
29. IAR – Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017
30. Transcript of Interview of (b) (7)(C) on March 30, 2017



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 6, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 29, 2017, Special Agent's (SA) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), conducted an interview with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

The purpose of the interview was to obtain information about alleged harassment by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Colorado River Agency (CRA), Parker, AZ. (b) (7)(C) agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview; it is not intended to be a verbatim account and does not memorialize all statements made during the interview.

(b) (7)(C) who in (b) (7)(C) as the (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) reservation which was located in both CA and AZ. There were approximately 4,500 CRIT members with two-thirds residing on the reservation. In (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) was informed the OIG was investigating the complaint against (b) (7)(C) whom (b) (7)(C) did not know. (b) (7)(C) verified the copy of the complaint letter and exhibits dated (b) (7)(C) brought to the interview by OIG was the same complaint document sent from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), BIA, CRA. (b) (7)(C) said the complaint letter, a (b) (7)(C) a (b) (7)(C), was written primarily by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C). It was during this meeting the (b) (7)(C) was made aware of the victim's identities and specific allegations against (b) (7)(C). The complaint letter was signed by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said he read the complaint letter after (b) (7)(C) but it had already been sent to (b) (7)(C).

Before the (b) (7)(C) meeting, (b) (7)(C) had been made aware of only one allegation against (b) (7)(C) which was made by (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) affirmed it was October 2016 when (b) (7)(C) told him about inappropriate messages she received from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: FCF77FE62564D292D263467451B09170

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

did not show (b) (7)(C) the messages. (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) was a BIA employee who worked with (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (7)(C) if she wanted to do anything about the messages (b) (7)(C) sent but (b) (7)(C) said her (b) (7)(C) would speak with (b) (7)(C). Later, (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (7)(C) if the matter was resolved and (b) (7)(C) told him it was and that her (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) did not take this matter to anyone else and believed (b) (7)(C) ceased sending messages to (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) learned about (b) (7)(C) allegations at the January 2017 (b) (7)(C). He did not know if (b) (7)(C) was a (b) (7)(C). Referencing the section of the complaint about (b) (7)(C) leaving a letter in (b) (7)(C) mailbox, SA (b) (7)(C) read, "Ms. (b) (7)(C) had a copy of the letter in her home mailbox sent to his supervisor at BIA, but nothing was done." (b) (7)(C) was informed (b) (7)(C) did not know if the letter was actually sent to the BIA. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged there were several documents on the table at the (b) (7)(C) and could not remember if he saw the letter.

(b) (7)(C) remembered (b) (7)(C) being present and very distressed at the (b) (7)(C) when she disclosed she had been dealing with (b) (7)(C) for years. (b) (7)(C) avowed he had not been aware. (b) (7)(C) was asked why (b) (7)(C) did not come forward sooner. He said (b) (7)(C) "kind of handled it on her own" but acknowledged she looked fearful in the meeting and opined it was because she kept seeing (b) (7)(C) at work. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) to the BIA (b) (7)(C) in Poston, AZ where (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) was afraid to meet (b) (7)(C) when she was alone (b) (7)(C). At the (b) (7)(C) meeting, (b) (7)(C) told CRIT (b) (7)(C) to plan for another employee to be with (b) (7)(C) while she (b) (7)(C) and to also have a police officer conduct extra patrols for her. (b) (7)(C) believed (b) (7)(C) counseled (b) (7)(C) to take someone (b) (7)(C) with her but he was unsure if that was done. (b) (7)(C) did not know if (b) (7)(C) obtained a restraining order on (b) (7)(C) but knew she was going to request one through (b) (7)(C) County, AZ while (b) (7)(C) a (b) (7)(C) submitted her request through the (b) (7)(C) Court.

(b) (7)(C) said, during the (b) (7)(C) meeting, (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) acknowledged (b) (7)(C) sent graphic text messages to her (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) wanted to meet with (b) (7)(C) but she dissuaded them. (b) (7)(C) did not think (b) (7)(C) wanted anything to get out of hand because (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) opined (b) (7)(C) did not bring the matter forward sooner to avoid making trouble.

According to (b) (7)(C) someone in the (b) (7)(C) meeting said BIA was aware of the complaint. When (b) (7)(C) was asked by the OIG what BIA did about the complaint, he replied, "Not much." (b) (7)(C) thought (b) (7)(C) supervisor at BIA, (b) (7)(C), made a response at some point but (b) (7)(C) did not know what it was.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) did not contact him about the complaint and claimed he had a difficult time contacting her. (b) (7)(C) then acknowledged (b) (7)(C) may have responded to the (b) (7)(C) complaint a few days prior to his interview with the OIG. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) never called him and that he always had to call her. He said the BIA facility was always locked which made it difficult to communicate with BIA personnel.

(b) (7)(C) concern was that employees should not be placed into these types of situations. (b) (7)(C) wanted

the complaints to be taken seriously because he had seen the end result of people not paying attention to these types of things. (b) (7)(C) said the affected employees were shocked because they never thought this would happen to them.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) actions were common knowledge among tribal members. He did not know if the CRIT Police Department (PD) did an investigation into the allegations but knew CRIT PD Investigator (b) (7)(C) spoke with two of (b) (7)(C) supervisors, unknown which. When (b) (7)(C) was asked if (b) (7)(C) worked for the tribe, he responded that he did not think so.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) actions should not have been allowed and that it appeared some of his actions occurred during the work day. (b) (7)(C) said if this happened with a CRIT employee, he (b) (7)(C) would work with human resources and have something done right away.

(b) (7)(C) was not aware of any other law enforcement agencies looking at (b) (7)(C) conduct and said it surprised him BIA Law Enforcement (LE) did not look into the matter. (b) (7)(C) said BIA LE used to be involved in a lot of the rape and murder investigations on the reservation, but they are hardly ever there for anything anymore. Because BIA LE are assigned to CRIT, he thought they would be present for more investigative work but they were frequently sent away on temporary details and when they were in the area, they do not respond to the serious crimes. (b) (7)(C) said, when (b) (7)(C), criminals alleged of committing murder who were incarcerated in the CRIT Jail escaped. (b) (7)(C) did not think BIA LE responded while other agencies did respond to assist. (b) (7)(C) said if crimes on the reservation involve non-Indians, the county law enforcement was allowed to come onto the reservation to investigate. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the CRIT PD can investigate both criminal and administrative matters.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 4, 2017
Report Subject Review of Documents Provided by (b) (7)(C)	

On March 28, 2017, Special Agent (SA) (b) (7)(C), U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), met with (b) (7)(C).
(b) (7)(C).

The purpose of the meeting was to obtain copies of investigative, complaint and court related documents regarding (b) (7)(C) Colorado River Agency (CRA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ. The following is a list and summary of the information provided; it is not intended to be a verbatim account and does not memorialize all statements made during the meeting.

- Letter dated (b) (7)(C), 2017 with attached exhibits A through G, from CRIT (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) to BIA (b) (7)(C) in reference to alleged harassing conduct by BIA employee (b) (7)(C).
- Exhibit A: (b) (7)(C) profile for (b) (7)(C) identifying himself as a (b) (7)(C) at BIA (b) (7)(C).
- Exhibit B: Sexually explicit text messages from (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) sent to (b) (7)(C).
- Exhibit C: Sexually explicit (b) (7)(C) messages sent from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) account. This exhibit contains sexually explicit text messages from (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) for (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) 2015. (b) (7)(C) identifies himself as a (b) (7)(C) who works near (b) (7)(C) residence and posted his cell phone of (b) (7)(C).
- Exhibit D: "Permanent Injunction Against Harassment" signed (b) (7)(C) by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) awarded to (b) (7)(C) and Petition for Protection Order in (b) (7)(C) Court filed by (b) (7)(C).
- Exhibit E: Sexually explicit letter written on back of BIA log sheet found by (b) (7)(C) in her mailbox (b) (7)(C) 2015. The letter stated, (b) (7)(C) call text."

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: DBF63D1B2A1D55609A3D7E5F2EB8AB28

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

- Exhibit F: Screenshots of messages sent 2013 by (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) copy of email from (b) (7)(C), CRIT (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C), dated (b) (7)(C), 2017, containing an email thread from (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (7)(C) email states (b) (7)(C) began texting her (b) (7)(C) 2013 with work related messages but later told her she was pretty. (b) (7)(C). Recently (b) (7)(C) received text messages from an unknown number with a request to share sexual messages to which she declined. On (b) (7)(C) 2016, she received a text from (b) (7)(C) asking for her name. The sender identified himself as (b) (7)(C), and a screenshot of the message from (b) (7)(C).”
- Exhibit G: Injunction Against Harassment, (b) (7)(C) Court, defendant (b) (7)(C) plaintiff (b) (7)(C) signed by judicial officer (b) (7)(C), 2017.
- Memorandum from (b) (7)(C) CRIT (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) CRIT. (b) (7)(C) memorandum states she received sexually graphic messages on two occasions from (b) (7)(C), and (b) (7)(C).
- Memorandum from (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C), 2017, advising (b) (7)(C) to see the enclosed copy of her complaint letter against (b) (7)(C) that was sent to BIA (b) (7)(C).
- Letter from (b) (7)(C) to BIA (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C), 2017. (b) (7)(C) informed (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) has “again” been texting her work cell phone during work hours and also informed her that in 2013, (b) (7)(C) was told to not contact (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) supervisor (b) (7)(C) confirmed with (b) (7)(C) that the number from which the messages were sent belonged to (b) (7)(C) and told her there was nothing he could do but refer her to the authorities. (b) (7)(C) wrote to (b) (7)(C) “Please consider this an official complaint on him (b) (7)(C)”
- (b) (7)(C) Court “Ex Parte Temporary Injunction Against Harassment”, plaintiff (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) defendant (b) (7)(C) signed by (b) (7)(C) Judge on (b) (7)(C), 2016.
- Investigative report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2016, suspect (b) (7)(C) victim (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Victim Advocate (b) (7)(C) provided (b) (7)(C) with (b) (7)(C) messages sent from (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) at the Injunction for Harassment hearing against (b) (7)(C) for which (b) (7)(C) did not appear.
- Supplemental report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2016, suspect (b) (7)(C) victim (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) sent (b) (7)(C) harassing text messages to (b) (7)(C) from (b) (7)(C) (which (b) (7)(C) verified as (b) (7)(C) phone) and (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).
- Supplemental report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2016, suspect (b) (7)(C) victim (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) wrote that (b) (7)(C) sent (b) (7)(C) graphic text messages. (b) (7)(C) opined (b) (7)(C) obtained her cell number from (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) was denied a (b) (7)(C) restraining order against (b) (7)(C) due to lack of justification. On (b) (7)(C) 2016, (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) supervisors) who acknowledged (b) (7)(C) had harassed co-workers (b) (7)(C) with graphic sexual text messages which created a hostile work environment. (b) (7)(C) wrote that the supervisors were working with their human resources office to “see what they could do.”
- Supplemental report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2016, suspect (b) (7)(C) victim (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) first received messages from (b) (7)(C) in

2013 which stopped until (b) (7)(C) 2016. (b) (7)(C) said the messages were not as graphic as the others.

- Supplemental report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2017, suspect (b) (7)(C) victim (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) left a letter on (b) (7)(C) car window in 2015. The letter was written on the back of a BIA (b) (7)(C) log sheet. (b) (7)(C) claimed she filed a complaint with (b) (7)(C) supervisor (b) (7)(C) who told her there was nothing he could do about the matter at the time. (b) (7)(C) filed a police report with Officer (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) looked up the reports to find there were only call notes and no report by Officer (b) (7)(C).
- Supplemental report (b) (7)(C) by Investigator (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2017, suspect (b) (7)(C). On (b) (7)(C) 2017, (b) (7)(C) learned that the only contact (b) (7)(C) County Sheriff's Office had with (b) (7)(C) was for a (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) contacted the Parker, AZ Police Department and learned their only contact with (b) (7)(C) was for a (b) (7)(C).
- (b) (7)(C) work schedule (b) (7)(C) 2015 through (b) (7)(C) 2016.
- (b) (7)(C) Police Department "Detail Call for Service (CFS) Report, 6 total pages. CFS Incident # (b) (7)(C) showed that on (b) (7)(C) 2016, (b) (7)(C) was served court documents by the (b) (7)(C) Police Department. CFS Incident (b) (7)(C) showed that on (b) (7)(C) 2016, (b) (7)(C) requested a case number for stalking, victim (b) (7)(C) suspect (b) (7)(C).



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 24, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 29, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (7)(C), regarding allegations that (b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency (CRA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ, harassed CRIT employees and community members when he sent unwelcome cellular text and social media messages, including sexually explicit texts and messages. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the interview was voluntary and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview.

(b) (7)(C) said she began her employment as the (b) (7)(C). According to (b) (7)(C) she (b) (7)(C) for a brief period of time (b) (7)(C) of hers, but returned to (b) (7)(C) in her same capacity as the (b) (7)(C) said her supervisor was (b) (7)(C).

We asked (b) (7)(C) to explain her knowledge of the allegations regarding (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said the allegations regarding (b) (7)(C) were originally brought to the attention of (b) (7)(C) by (b) (7)(C) to the (b) (7)(C) in September 2016. (b) (7)(C) explained that (b) (7)(C) was out of the office at the time (b) (7)(C) reported she had received about 100 very explicit text messages. According to (b) (7)(C) a review of the text messages determined the messages were "incredibly inappropriate" but did not rise to the level of criminality. Subsequently, she said, (b) (7)(C) Police Department Investigator (b) (7)(C) was assigned to conduct an investigation into the matter.

(b) (7)(C) said in January 2017, a (b) (7)(C) meeting was held and she learned that (b) (7)(C) had been sending inappropriate text messages to (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) directed her to draft the complaint letter on his behalf to be sent to CRA (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said she coordinated with Investigator (b) (7)(C) and obtained copies of his investigative report. (b) (7)(C) added that she used documents from Investigator (b) (7)(C) report to draft the complaint letter.

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: 0BB492EE05E6E28E171D69B2EE885DAC

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 24, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 29, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (7)(C) regarding allegations that (b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency (CRA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ, sent her unwelcome and sexually explicit (b) (7)(C) messages. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the interview was voluntary and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview.

When asked to explain her relationship with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said she had never met (b) (7)(C) and did not have a relationship with him. According to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) knew who she was through her (b) (7)(C), and said that (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) had been (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) initially contacted her when he placed a letter in her home mailbox and asked her if she was single, married, bi-sexual, or if she had a boyfriend. According to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) wrote his name on the letter and asked her to call him if she was "interested." (b) (7)(C) said she "ignored" the letter. She said that she no longer had the letter and had given it to (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said she could not remember specifically when she received the letter from (b) (7)(C) but it was six months to a year before she began receiving his (b) (7)(C) messages in (b) (7)(C) 2015.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) began sending her (b) (7)(C) messages asking if she wore a G-string and other "stuff." The messages became more graphic when he sent pictures of someone's buttocks wearing a G-string. (b) (7)(C) said she received (b) (7)(C) messages from (b) (7)(C) account, but she thought it was (b) (7)(C) and not (b) (7)(C), sending the messages.

(b) (7)(C) said she was scared to go outside of her house and that she knew (b) (7)(C) drove a (b) (7)(C) and worked as a (b) (7)(C) on a nearby (b) (7)(C). She said that she was worried that (b) (7)(C) may be watching her because she had seen a (b) (7)(C) on the (b) (7)(C), but was not sure if it was him because she did not know what (b) (7)(C) looked like.

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: B8DAF95A020FA8AD42EF3FE461299CEE

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

(b) (7)(C) said she reported the incidents regarding (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) and the (b) (7)(C) Police Department. She also filed for and received a restraining order [Injunction Against Harassment] against (b) (7)(C) from the (b) (7)(C) Court.

Agent's Note: During the interview, we showed (b) (7)(C) all of the (b) (7)(C) messages associated with her, which she acknowledged she had received from (b) (7)(C)



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 10, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 31, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (7)(C), Bureau of Indian Affairs (b) (7)(C), regarding allegations that he harassed Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) employees and community members when he sent unwelcomed cellular text and social media messages, including sexually explicit texts and messages. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview.

(b) (7)(C) said he began his employment with the Colorado River Agency (CRA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) as (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said his duty location was (b) (7)(C) AZ and that his supervisors were (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), CRA, BIA. (b) (7)(C) added that his work schedule alternated between day and night shifts and explained that he worked 4 weeks on day shift and then 4 weeks on night shift.

When asked if he had sent cellular text messages in (b) (7)(C) 2013 to (b) (7)(C) asking her if she was single, that he had been thinking of her, and that she was a very beautiful woman, (b) (7)(C) said yes. (b) (7)(C) explained that he had been kicked out of his house by his (b) (7)(C), he was “feeling down” and that he was looking to “date” (b) (7)(C).

When asked if he had again sent cellular text messages in (b) (7)(C) 2016 to (b) (7)(C) asking her for her name and telling her his name was (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) said yes. (b) (7)(C) explained that some time had passed since he last texted (b) (7)(C) [2013] and thought maybe (b) (7)(C) was “interested” and that maybe she wanted to “go out” with him. Furthermore, (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that he was aware that (b) (7)(C) had placed an Injunction Against Harassment court order against him on (b) (7)(C), 2017. (b) (7)(C) said he did not contest the order nor did he appear before court. According to (b) (7)(C) he had stopped all contact with (b) (7)(C).

When asked if he had sent cellular text messages on (b) (7)(C) 2016 to (b) (7)(C)

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: 6959F2486B81CDD03D0FBFCA759F93ED

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

(b) (7)(C) said yes. (b) (7)(C) explained that he did not remember how he began communicating with (b) (7)(C) but that it was something similar to telling her that she was “beautiful” or “hot.” (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) of his and that after he had sent (b) (7)(C) the messages, (b) (7)(C) texted him back and told him to stop texting (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) was asked if he had sent a text message to (b) (7)(C) that asked her if she had (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) admitted he sent the text message and explained that he did so because he did not recognize (b) (7)(C) phone number on (b) (7)(C) phone and suspected that (b) (7)(C) had been cheating on him. Subsequently, he said, he sent the text message, however, he was unaware that (b) (7)(C) was the recipient of the text.

When asked if he had sent (b) (7)(C) messages on (b) (7)(C), 2015 to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said yes. (b) (7)(C) explained that he knew (b) (7)(C) through (b) (7)(C), whom he had (b) (7)(C). According to (b) (7)(C) he wanted to go out with (b) (7)(C) but not be serious about it. When asked, (b) (7)(C) admitted that he wanted to have sex with (b) (7)(C). Furthermore, (b) (7)(C) admitted that he had placed a letter inside (b) (7)(C) home mailbox. (b) (7)(C) said he could not recall what he wrote on the letter, but that it was probably something similar to all the “other cruel crap” he had sent her through messages. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged (b) (7)(C) had placed an Injunction Against Harassment against him and said that he had been in compliance with the order.

When asked, (b) (7)(C) admitted that he had placed a handwritten note on the windshield of (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) vehicle asking her if she wanted to go out and provided her his telephone number.

(b) (7)(C) acknowledged that as a Government employee, unprofessional conduct applied to both on and off duty. According to (b) (7)(C) until three or four months ago, he believed that using his personal phone and being off duty when he sent inappropriate texts would not be a “problem.” However, he said he read later the “ethics part” and learned that it didn’t matter if his unprofessional conduct was on or off duty. Finally, (b) (7)(C) admitted that all of the cellular texts and social media messages he had sent were unprofessional and inappropriate.

Agent’s Note: During the interview, (b) (7)(C) was shown copies of all cellular text and social media messages associated to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) which (b) (7)(C) admitted he had sent.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 4, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 29, 2017, Special Agent's (SA) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), conducted an interview with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)

The purpose of the interview was to obtain information about alleged harassment by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Colorado River Agency (CRA), Parker, AZ. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview; it is not intended to be a verbatim account and does not memorialize all statements made during the interview.

(b) (7)(C) of the (b) (7)(C), was hired by the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C). In 2013 (b) (7)(C) as the (b) (7)(C). Her supervisor is (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) who was (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C), was (b) (7)(C) at BIA in nearby (b) (7)(C) AZ. (b) (7)(C) worked in the BIA (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) worked in the (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) does not know (b) (7)(C) personally and only met him once when (b) (7)(C) helped her and (b) (7)(C) Parker, AZ. (b) (7)(C) had not seen (b) (7)(C) before the (b) (7)(C) nor has she seen him since.

According to (b) (7)(C) on September 4, 2016 at approximately 9:30 p.m., she received over 70 text messages on her government issued cell phone (b) (7)(C) from a phone number which was not in her contact list. (b) (7)(C) never responded to the "very explicit text messages" but showed them to (b) (7)(C) who became upset. The following morning, (b) (7)(C) received 5-10 messages from a different number but the messages were similar to those from the previous night. Because they were similar in content, (b) (7)(C) believed the same person sent both groups of messages. (b) (7)(C) reviewed all of the messages and decided to report it to (b) (7)(C) who told (b) (7)(C) he would forward the matter to a (b) (7)(C) Information Technology employee who could block the number from her phone.

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: 6937056AABFADDE4B5E38326CF815492

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

Soon after, (b) (7)(C) sent a memorandum and screen shot of all the messages to (b) (7)(C) who notified the (b) (7)(C) Police and (b) (7)(C) Legal Department.

(b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) Police Department Investigator (b) (7)(C) who recognized one of the numbers as belonging to (b) (7)(C) because of other complaints received about (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) however could not remember which number of the two (b) (7)(C) recognized. If the messages were sent to her personal phone, (b) (7)(C) said she probably would not have reported the matter to police. (b) (7)(C) did not remember if (b) (7)(C) searched her phone and opined she may have showed the messages to him.

(b) (7)(C) did not know how (b) (7)(C) obtained her government cell phone number because she never gave it to him. (b) (7)(C) affirmed she did not know if (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) about the text messages he sent (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) professed she did not know if (b) (7)(C) knew it was her whom he was texting and opined he was "looking for someone."

(b) (7)(C) said that in August 2016, (b) (7)(C) contacted her through his (b) (7)(C) messenger account asking if she was (b) (7)(C) to which she replied yes. Within a couple days, (b) (7)(C) contacted her through (b) (7)(C) again telling (b) (7)(C) she was "hot" so (b) (7)(C) showed (b) (7)(C) who agreed he would speak with (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) had been in trouble for texting other women in BIA offices. (b) (7)(C) affirmed no one from BIA contacted her about the messages she received from (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) no longer had the (b) (7)(C) messages (b) (7)(C) sent nor did she give them to the police. (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) but (b) (7)(C) did not know what (b) (7)(C) said. According to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) did not "bother" her again until he sent the numerous text messages (b) (7)(C) 2016.

(b) (7)(C) reviewed the screenshots of the text messages provided within (b) (7)(C) complaint letter to BIA (b) (7)(C) dated (b) (7)(C) 2017 and acknowledged she received them from phone numbers (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) as indicated on the screenshots. (b) (7)(C) searched both numbers in (b) (7)(C) and learned one (unknown which) was tied to (b) (7)(C) account. (b) (7)(C) thought (b) (7)(C) was (b) (7)(C) who goes by the nick name of (b) (7)(C). After receiving the text messages, (b) (7)(C) located a picture of (b) (7)(C) on (b) (7)(C) in the event he ever approached her. Receiving the text and (b) (7)(C) messages from (b) (7)(C) made (b) (7)(C) feel "very awkward" and "creeped out" because they were "very explicit and very scary." (b) (7)(C) professed she feels safe at work and is not concerned (b) (7)(C) will contact her.

(b) (7)(C) said others who received messages from (b) (7)(C) were (b) (7)(C) who found a letter on her car, (b) (7)(C), whose issues with (b) (7)(C) have gone on for years, and (b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) who was concerned because (b) (7)(C) new where she lived. (b) (7)(C) was concerned because she worked alone at the (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) was a (b) (7)(C) who could be working in the same area. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) was upset because (b) (7)(C) supervisor told her to "quit baiting" (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) did not know which supervisor allegedly made this comment.

(b) (7)(C) acknowledged if (b) (7)(C) was fired, he would still be in the community. (b) (7)(C) was concerned because (b) (7)(C) was hired at the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) attend. Because of that she wondered if she should have ever reported (b) (7)(C).



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Unprofessional Conduct by Bureau of Indian Affairs Employee	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 11, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 30, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (7)(C), regarding allegations that (b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency (CRA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ, harassed CRIT employees and community members when he sent unwelcomed cellular text and social media messages, including sexually explicit texts and messages. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview.

(b) (7)(C) said she began her employment with (b) (7)(C) as a (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C), she said, she became the (b) (7)(C) and that her supervisor was (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said in early 2013, (b) (7)(C) sent her text messages asking her if she was single and if her phone was a personal phone. (b) (7)(C) said she told (b) (7)(C) to get "back to work" and that he didn't "need to know that." (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) again sent her text messages in August 2013 telling her he had been thinking of her and how pretty she looked. (b) (7)(C) said she informed (b) (7)(C) supervisor, (b) (7)(C), about (b) (7)(C) sending her text messages and told him that (b) (7)(C) had no business texting her and that she felt uncomfortable. According to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) was subsequently (b) (7)(C), but did not know if his (b) (7)(C) was a result of him texting her.

(b) (7)(C) said in late 2016, she received a text message from an unknown phone number asking her who she was. (b) (7)(C) said the unknown individual told her she and her phone number were in a "sexting list" and asked her if she wanted to "sext with me." (b) (7)(C) said at the time her phone was having issues and that she had to do a "total reboot" on it, which erased everything. However, she got another text message which she recognized was the same phone number. According to (b) (7)(C) the text messenger identified himself as (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said the text message had bothered her and suspected it might be from (b) (7)(C). Subsequently she approached (b) (7)(b) (7)(C) who was a supervisor

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
Authentication Number: 3898DE977BC604EEBE84D736C745A9A2	

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

at BIA, and showed him the phone number from the text messages she had received. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) confirmed that the phone number used to text her belonged to (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said she felt “extremely unsafe” at work knowing that (b) (7)(C) knew her and what vehicle she drove. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) told her that he couldn’t do anything for her regarding (b) (7)(C) and told her to go report (b) (7)(C) to the police department. (b) (7)(C) said she was reluctant to report (b) (7)(C) to the police because she didn’t want to be retaliated against. However, after speaking with other women who were (b) (7)(C), she decided to go ahead and seek an Injunction.

(b) (7)(C) acknowledged that she petitioned and received an Injunction Against Harassment (Injunction) against (b) (7)(C) which she confirmed was finalized on (b) (7)(C) 2017. According to (b) (7)(C) the (b) (7)(C) Police Department served (b) (7)(C) the Injunction. Finally, (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) had not made contact with her since the Injunction was issued.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 19, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 30, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) interviewed (b) (7)(C), regarding allegations that (b) (7)(C), CRA, BIA, Parker, AZ, harassed Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) employees and community members when he sent unwelcomed cellular text and social media messages, including sexually explicit texts and messages. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview.

(b) (7)(C) said he began his employment with (b) (7)(C) as (b) (7)(C). In (b) (7)(C), he said, he became an (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) added that in (b) (7)(C), he was promoted to his current position as the (b) (7)(C) and that his supervisor was (b) (7)(C), who was (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) was asked to explain his relationship with (b) (7)(C). According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) had already been working at (b) (7)(C) when he (b) (7)(C) began his employment with (b) (7)(C) in (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said he and (b) (7)(C) had been friends (b) (7)(C) and explained that they (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), however, he said, they were not close friends.

When asked to explain (b) (7)(C) work schedule, (b) (7)(C) told us that (b) (7)(C) rotated between day and night shifts. According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) would work four weeks on day shift followed by four weeks on night shift. (b) (7)(C) added that (b) (7)(C) an Excel spreadsheet program and (b) (7)(C) schedule on the office wall for all the employees. (b) (7)(C) said there were seven work divisions that (b) (7)(C), he said, worked alone and was typically assigned to work divisions (b) (7)(C).

We asked (b) (7)(C) if he was aware that (b) (7)(C) had been sending sexual text messages to various females in the community, as had been reported. (b) (7)(C) said yes and explained that he believed his

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: 67D0F62ECCBC2DBC027A44B74B47BBBB

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

supervisor, (b) (7)(C), had spoken to (b) (7)(C) at some point in time about sending the messages and told (b) (7)(C) “he can’t be doing this” and to “knock it off.”

We asked (b) (7)(C) if (b) (7)(C) had worked on a (b) (7)(C) that was near (b) (7)(C) residence. (b) (7)(C) said yes, that (b) (7)(C) residence was located in (b) (7)(C) and that it was about (b) (7)(C) from a (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) worked on the (b) (7)(C) next to (b) (7)(C) house on a regular basis. Additionally, (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) and other (b) (7)(C) drove (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) added their (b) (7)(C) had no markings on them except for Government license plates.

(b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C), spoke to him about receiving unwanted text messages and acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) had sent the messages. According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) text messages to (b) (7)(C) were about him being more “chatty” with her than official work related matters.

We asked (b) (7)(C) if he was aware that (b) (7)(C) had an Injunction Against Harassment (Injunction) placed on (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the Injunction and explained that he requested (b) (7)(C) provide him a copy of the Injunction because (b) (7)(C) wanted him to enforce the Injunction. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) provided him a copy of the Injunction, which he said looked “legit.” (b) (7)(C) added that he did not discuss the Injunction with (b) (7)(C) however, he said, that according to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) had been served the Injunction.

Agent’s Note: On (b) (7)(C) 2017, the (b) (7)(C) Court, (b) (7)(C) AZ issued (b) (7)(C) an Injunction Against Harassment on (b) (7)(C). The Injunction disclosed (b) (7)(C) was to have no contact with (b) (7)(C) and listed (b) (7)(C) residence and workplace as protected locations.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 5, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 30, 2017, Special Agent's (SA) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), conducted an interview with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

The purpose of the interview was to obtain information about alleged harassment by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) Colorado River Agency (CRA), Parker, AZ. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview; it is not intended to be a verbatim account and does not memorialize all statements made during the interview.

(b) (7)(C) began working for the (b) (7)(C) in the (b) (7)(C) and served in the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) years. In (b) (7)(C) she was (b) (7)(C) to the (b) (7)(C) as the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) does not know (b) (7)(C) personally, but does know who he was and where he lived. (b) (7)(C) has known (b) (7)(C) since (b) (7)(C) was a (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) went by the nickname (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said the incident with (b) (7)(C) began around (b) (7)(C), 2016 when (b) (7)(C) wanted to purchase a (b) (7)(C) from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) did not make her purchase that day and "innocently" gave (b) (7)(C) her phone number of (b) (7)(C) so they could connect later, but that they kept missing each other. (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) finally met in (b) (7)(C) AZ one evening conducted their transaction for the (b) (7)(C).

Early in the morning and later in the (b) (7)(C) week of December 2016, (b) (7)(C) said she received a text message asking if she "liked other women." A few days later, she received a text message that stated (b) (7)(C) thought the sender was trying to determine if she was male or female. (b) (7)(C) said a "red flag" went off so she told (b) (7)(C) who told her to not respond. (b) (7)(C)

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: 4E4D90DDA4BC4C84D13A03F7584349D2

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

thought if she ignored the messages, the sender would stop sending them, however, she received as many as six more text messages that she thought may still be on her phone.

(b) (7)(C) did not know (b) (7)(C) cell phone number and a review of (b) (7)(C) call log by SA (b) (7)(C) showed the log went back to (b) (7)(C), 2016.

After (b) (7)(C) received a third message, she spoke with her (b) (7)(C), a (b) (7)(C) employee familiar with (b) (7)(C) sending similar text messages to others in the community. (b) (7)(C) opined (b) (7)(C) sent the text messages to (b) (7)(C) so (b) (7)(C) blocked the number on (b) (7)(C) cell phone. (b) (7)(C) believed the number used to send the first text message to her was the same number she used to communicate with (b) (7)(C) but (b) (7)(C) could not remember the number.

With assistance from SA (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) located two of the latter text messages on her cell phone sent from (b) (7)(C). One was sent (b) (7)(C) 2016 at 6:57 a.m. which read, (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C). The second was sent the same date at 9:57 a.m. which read, "Does (b) (7)(C) cell sound familiar?" (b) (7)(C) did not know why the 9:57 a.m. text message was sent to her nor did she know to whom the phone number belonged. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged she deleted some of the text messages.

(b) (7)(C) did not know why (b) (7)(C) asked if she (b) (7)(C) and opined he may have asked to solicit a response. (b) (7)(C) was asked about the possibility that (b) (7)(C) had sent the messages. (b) (7)(C) had no knowledge of (b) (7)(C) being bi-sexual and stated it would surprise her if she sent the messages.

(b) (7)(C) believed (b) (7)(C) sent her the text messages because (b) (7)(C) received similar messages from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) met with (b) (7)(C) and another (b) (7)(C) in the summer of 2016 to express her concerns about (b) (7)(C) sending her harassing texts and (b) (7)(C) messages asking (b) (7)(C) if she was "straight" and "Are you gay?" (b) (7)(C) also asked (b) (7)(C) if she wanted to be involved in a "threesome." (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) also came forward with concerns about messages (b) (7)(C) sent her. (b) (7)(C) was also concerned about her vulnerability working alone at the (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) who recommended (b) (7)(C) obtain a restraining order. Through (b) (7)(C) Court, (b) (7)(C) filed a request for a restraining order against (b) (7)(C) but it was denied. (b) (7)(C) opined the reason for the declination was due to her not being physically harmed by (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) spoke with (b) (7)(C) Police Department Investigator (b) (7)(C) and told him she was concerned for her safety, locked herself in her home and asked what else she could do. (b) (7)(C) said he would send a police officer to speak with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) later told (b) (7)(C) an officer did contact (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) received no more texts and has had no contact with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) did not remember if Investigator (b) (7)(C) reviewed the text messages on her phone or not.

Describing the personal impact this has caused, (b) (7)(C) was concerned for her own safety because she was alone at home during the week because her (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said she continued to walk for exercise but did so on the main road near her home and stayed away from the (b) (7)(C) roads to walk unless her (b) (7)(C) was home. (b) (7)(C) sometimes felt safe when she locked the

doors to her alarmed home and when her (b) (7)(C) was home.

(b) (7)(C) did not report to BIA what happened to her. (b) (7)(C) was aware (b) (7)(C) sent a response to (b) (7)(C) complaint indicating the matter was being investigated or forwarded to others who were looking into the matter. (b) (7)(C) said however, the BIA was slow in responding to the Tribe.

(b) (7)(C) said the (b) (7)(C) four page letter to (b) (7)(C) came about after the (b) (7)(C) 2017 meeting with the involved parties to discuss what happened to each of them.

(b) (7)(C) professed she wanted (b) (7)(C) to be a healthy and productive (b) (7)(C) in the community but believed (b) (7)(C) needed help. (b) (7)(C) said removing (b) (7)(C) from the (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) would be the easy way to deal with the situation but it might not be in the best interest of (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the (b) (7)(C) had the authority to direct the police to conduct extra patrols in the (b) (7)(C) areas as well as direct (b) (7)(C) Social Services to check the welfare of the (b) (7)(C) and the (b) (7)(C) has discussed these possible actions.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 24, 2017
Report Subject Document Review of (b) (7)(C) Work Schedules and Federal Personnel Payroll System	

On March 30, 2017, Office of Inspector General (OIG) Special Agents (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) met with (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Parker, AZ, and requested he provide this office copies of (b) (7)(C), CRA, BIA, Parker, AZ, work schedules from (b) (7)(C) 2015 through (b) (7)(C) 2017. The purpose of the request was to determine if (b) (7)(C) was scheduled to work on the dates he sent texts or (b) (7)(C) messages to Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) employees or tribal members. On March 31, 2017, (b) (7)(C) provided digitally scanned copies of CRA's available work schedules, which included (b) (7)(C) scheduled work dates.

We compared (b) (7)(C) scheduled duty dates to his payroll records [Federal Personnel Payroll System (FPPS)] to determine if (b) (7)(C) was paid on his scheduled duty dates. We determined that (b) (7)(C) was paid on his scheduled duty dates when he sent (b) (7)(C) messages to a CRIT tribal member and text messages to a CRIT employee.

(b) (7)(C) sent (b) (7)(C) messages to CRIT (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C), 2015, Scheduled Duty from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (b) (7)(C) sent 13 (b) (7)(C) messages to (b) (7)(C) (Enclosure 1).

(b) (7)(C), 2015, Scheduled Duty from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (b) (7)(C) sent 4 (b) (7)(C) messages to (b) (7)(C) (see Enclosure 1).

(b) (7)(C), 2015, Scheduled Duty from 7:00 to 4:00 p.m. (b) (7)(C) sent 12 (b) (7)(C) messages to (b) (7)(C) (see Enclosure 1).

(b) (7)(C) sent text messages to CRIT employee (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C) 2016, Scheduled Duty from 7:00 to 4:00 p.m. (b) (7)(C) sent three text messages to

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
Authentication Number: A2C1BF0A5BE34A2BF86C7AAACC4405B5	

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

(b) (7)(C) (Enclosure 2).

Enclosures:

1. (b) (7)(C) Work Schedule, FPPS printout, and (b) (7)(C) Messages.
2. (b) (7)(C) Work Schedule, FPPS printout, and Text Messages.



OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITY REPORT

Case Title Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency	Case Number OI-PI-17-0395-I
Reporting Office Program Integrity Division	Report Date April 7, 2017
Report Subject Interview of (b) (7)(C)	

On March 30, 2017, Special Agent's (SA) (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C), U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), conducted an interview with (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) Police Department (PD), Parker, AZ.

The purpose of the interview was to obtain information about alleged harassment by (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Colorado River Agency (CRA), Parker, AZ. (b) (7)(C) signed a Warnings and Assurances for Voluntary Interviews and agreed to have the interview recorded. The following is a summary of the interview; it is not intended to be a verbatim account and does not memorialize all statements made during the interview.

(b) (7)(C) began his employment with (b) (7)(C) PD as a (b) (7)(C) in (b) (7)(C) and was responsible for the (b) (7)(C) as well as (b) (7)(C) of sexual offenders under the Sexual Offender Registration Notification Act (SORNA).

In August 2016, (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) sent sex messages via text to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) followed up with CRIT Victim (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), who provided (b) (7)(C) with copies of explicit messages (b) (7)(C) sent to (b) (7)(C) cell phone via (b) (7)(C) messenger. (b) (7)(C) said the messages were sent from (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) profile. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (7)(C) things such as, "Are you single?", "Are you bi?", and "Are you getting horny?" (b) (7)(C) was asked how he knew (b) (7)(C) sent the messages and not (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) professed he did not verify that and said it was a possibility (b) (7)(C) had sent the messages.

(b) (7)(C) also obtained text messages that (b) (7)(C) sent to (b) (7)(C) from his (b) (7)(C) account. (b) (7)(C) said these were similar to messages sent through (b) (7)(C) messenger to include statements indicating (b) (7)(C) had been watching (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) "I'm working down in the area tomorrow" and "I'm in an open relationship with my (b) (7)(C)." (b) (7)(C) stated, "So his text messages are really graphic, saying, 'Hey,

Reporting Official/Title (b) (7)(C) /Special Agent	Signature Digitally signed.
---	--------------------------------

Authentication Number: AE75356286F4FF04911CECA2FB7A6A73

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG), and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of this document is not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OI-003 (05/14)

you know, I want you to dominate me. I want you to fuck me in the ass.” According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) sent these messages from phone number (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) was able to connect (b) (7)(C) to the text messages because this phone number was a recurring number through all of the incidents that involved (b) (7)(C) text messaging.

(b) (7)(C) said the screenshots of the text messages he was provided contained (b) (7)(C) name at the top and in the body of the text. (b) (7)(C) asked (b) (7)(C) to call him at (b) (7)(C). Reviewing copies of the documents brought to the interview by OIG, (b) (7)(C) acknowledged (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) he was on (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) did not look into the (b) (7)(C) address cited by (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said, when he spoke with (b) (7)(C) she said (b) (7)(C) had driven by her home before and claimed she was scared and did not feel comfortable to walk out of her house because (b) (7)(C) may be there or watching her from a distance.

(b) (7)(C) professed he spoke with (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) supervisor, and another person whom he believed to be BIA employee (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) or (b) (7)(C) verified (b) (7)(C) cell phone number (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) acknowledged he obtained (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) work schedule from (b) (7)(C) or (b) (7)(C) for the time period (b) (7)(C) 2015 through (b) (7)(C) 2016, because he wanted to cross check the messages with (b) (7)(C) work schedule, however, he (b) (7)(C) did not complete the task due to his case load.

(b) (7)(C) checked with local law enforcement agencies and learned the only response by local law enforcement involved a (b) (7)(C) residence. (b) (7)(C) however, could not recall if he checked with BIA Office of Justice Services (OJS) Law Enforcement (LE). (b) (7)(C) searched (b) (7)(C) criminal history and found a single citation but nothing else.

According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) obtained a restraining order on (b) (7)(C) through the (b) (7)(C) court where (b) (7)(C) attended the hearing and testified. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) did not show up to testify but knew he was served with the final order. In the hearing, (b) (7)(C) testified about a letter she received from (b) (7)(C) in her mailbox in (b) (7)(C) 2015. (b) (7)(C) did not see the letter but (b) (7)(C) told him that her (b) (7)(C), last name unknown, who previously worked at BIA (b) (7)(C), took the letter to the BIA supervisor a few weeks after she received it. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) confirmed he received the letter from (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) informed him about (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) receiving messages from (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) she received graphic text messages from (b) (7)(C) and believed the sender was (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) received a second set of messages from (b) (7)(C) but (b) (7)(C) was not able to verify who was associated with that number. (b) (7)(C) added that he was confident the second set of messages were from the same person who sent the first set of messages to (b) (7)(C) because the content was similar. (b) (7)(C) said CRIT PD received a copy of a letter (b) (7)(C) sent to (b) (7)(C) asking that the matter be looked into. (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) that her (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) was going to speak with (b) (7)(C) and tell him to cease sending (b) (7)(C) text messages. (b) (7)(C) affirmed he did not speak with (b) (7)(C).

(b) (7)(C) said the next complaint (b) (7)(C) asked him to investigate was from (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) explained to (b) (7)(C) that she bought a (b) (7)(C) from (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) opined (b) (7)(C) obtained her cell phone from (b) (7)(C) because she called (b) (7)(C) a

few times asking when she could pick up the (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) she received three or four text messages and actually deleted some of them before he (b) (7)(C) saw them. (b) (7)(C) saw only two text messages which were both dated (b) (7)(C) 2016 in which the sender asked, "Have (b) (7)(C)", "Who is this guy? Girl, are you gay?" (b) (7)(C) did not get copies of the text messages which (b) (7)(C) was supposed to send to him but he did not follow up with her. According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) did not remember the sender's phone number. (b) (7)(C) attempted to obtain a restraining order through (b) (7)(C) court but her request was denied. (b) (7)(C) offered to testify at the restraining order request hearing but (b) (7)(C) did not invite him. As far as (b) (7)(C) knew, the text messages to (b) (7)(C) stopped.

(b) (7)(C) professed he spoke with (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C)" at the BIA (b) (7)(C) who told (b) (7)(C) they were having problems with (b) (7)(C) harassing (b) (7)(C) with graphic sex texting messages and added that the work environment at the BIA was becoming hostile. They told (b) (7)(C) they called the BIA Human Resource Office in Phoenix, AZ numerous times, but due to (b) (7)(C) not physically harassing any employee, there was "basically nothing" they could do because the effected individuals were not employees. When (b) (7)(C) was asked if this was a different meeting with (b) (7)(C) supervisors from the meeting discussed previously about (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) could not recall if he actually spoke with the BIA supervisor's about (b) (7)(C) information. When asked if he spoke with them about (b) (7)(C) concerns, he said, "I told them that there was other people."

(b) (7)(C) learned of (b) (7)(C) complaint on (b) (7)(C) from (b) (7)(C) who provided (b) (7)(C) with screenshots of messages (b) (7)(C) sent (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) was employed with the (b) (7)(C) and worked with (b) (7)(C) at times and tried to avoid him unless she absolutely had to work with him.

According to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) first text messages to (b) (7)(C) in 2013 were job related then his questions became personal when he asked her, "May I ask if this is your personal cell phone?" and, "Are you single?" (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) also told (b) (7)(C) she was beautiful. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) tried to keep the conversation work related but told him to cease sending her messages.

(b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) received new text messages in November 2016 when the sender asked for her and her employer's name. (b) (7)(C) said the sender told (b) (7)(C) his name was (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) told the sender he had the wrong number. (b) (7)(C) said this made (b) (7)(C) very uncomfortable and kind of "weirded out."

(b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) she spoke with others to whom similar things happened so she decided to report what happened to her. (b) (7)(C) did not know if (b) (7)(C) requested a restraining order but he did recommend to her that she do so.

When (b) (7)(C) was asked if (b) (7)(C) said anything to him about her speaking with (b) (7)(C) supervisor's, (b) (7)(C) said he did not recall.

(b) (7)(C) said it seemed to him that (b) (7)(C) was targeting tribal members prior to contacting (b) (7)(C) who was (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) thought it possible (b) (7)(C) believed (b) (7)(C) to be a tribal member. (b) (7)(C) opined (b) (7)(C) may be targeting tribal members because he knows he cannot be prosecuted since he is a (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) mentioned that (b) (7)(C) former employee at the BIA (b) (7)(C), had similar occurrences with (b) (7)(C) but

(b) (7)(C) had not been able to locate (b) (7)(C)

Finally, (b) (7)(C) said none of the victims disclosed a previous relationship with (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) behavior was a “very big telltale sign of stalking or how to start.” (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) behavior was not appropriate for a government employee. (b) (7)(C) affirmed he never interviewed (b) (7)(C) however, he attempted to locate him a few times.




OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Memorandum

MAY 05 2017

To: Weldon "Bruce" Loudermilk
Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs

From: Matthew T. Elliott 
Assistant Inspector General for Investigations

Subject: Report of Investigation – Sexual Harassment at the BIA Colorado River Agency
Case No. OI-PI-17-0395-I

We have completed an investigation into allegations brought forward by Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) alleged that (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C), Colorado River Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Parker, AZ, harassed CRIT employees and tribal members by sending them unwelcome and sexually explicit texts and (b) (7)(C) messages. (b) (7)(C) also alleged that (b) (7)(C) conduct had caused a CRIT employee and a tribal member to file injunctions against harassment on (b) (7)(C) out of concern for their safety.

Our investigation substantiated all of the allegations against (b) (7)(C). We found that (b) (7)(C) conduct, both on and off duty, was egregious and unprofessional, and that it reflected poorly on the U.S. Government. We also confirmed that the CRIT employee and the community member had filed injunctions against (b) (7)(C) because his conduct had caused them to fear for their safety.

During our investigation, we became concerned about how BIA management officials responded when they learned of (b) (7)(C) inappropriate conduct. We have opened a separate investigation focusing on their response, and we will provide a report to you when that investigation is complete.

We are referring the attached report of our investigation to your office for any action you deem necessary. Please provide us with a written response to the report and complete the attached Accountability Form within 90 days of the date of this memorandum. You may either email your response to doioigreferrals@doioig.gov, or mail it to:

Office of Inspector General
U.S. Department of the Interior
381 Elden Street, Suite 3000
Herndon, VA 20170

We intend to publish the results of this investigation on our website, in redacted or summary form, no sooner than 30 days from the date of this memorandum. Within the next 10 business days, a representative from our Office of Investigations will contact you, or your designee, to discuss our report, the status of your response, and the method we intend to use to publish our investigative results. If you have questions during your review, please contact me at (b) (7)(C).

Attachments (2)



U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of Inspector General

ACCOUNTABILITY FORM

Memorandum

To: Matthew Elliott
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations

From: Weldon Bruce Loudermilk
Director, BIA

Subject: Accountability Notice

Accountability Notice:

Case name: Sexual Harassment at BIA Agency
Case #: OI-HQ-17-0395-R

This form documents the action taken by the bureau/office regarding the subject case. The nature of the administrative action(s) is explained under details, and a copy of the action letter is attached.

1) Personnel Actions:

(b) Verbal reprimand/Counseling	(b) Notice of warning
(7) Written reprimand	(7) Suspension
(C) Reduction in grade/pay	(C) Removal
Other (explain): _____	

2) No Action Taken:

☐ Unsubstantiated

☐ Other (explain) (b) (7)(C)

3) Monetary recovery: Amount \$ _____

4) Details: *(Please summarize details of action as needed.)*

Name of Case Review Approving Official: _____

Name of Proposing Official: (b) (7)(C)

Name of Deciding Official: (b) (7)(C)

Name(s) of other official(s) providing input: *(ie. HR, Solicitor, etc.)*

Signature: (Authorized Bureau Official) Weldon B. Loudermilk

Date: 5-23-17

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

This document is the property of the Department of the Interior, Office of Inspector General (OIG) and may contain information that is protected from disclosure by law. Distribution and reproduction of the document are not authorized without the express written permission of the OIG.

OI-005 (05/09)